

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Corpus Text of Ovid *P. Ovidi Nasonis Opera ex corpore poetarum Latinorum a Iohanne Percival Postgate edito separatim typis impressa. Tomi i. ii. iii. Londini. G. Bell et Filii. MDCCCXCVIII.*

Arthur Bernard Cook

The Classical Review / Volume 13 / Issue 04 / May 1899, pp 220 - 220
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00078483, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00078483

How to cite this article:

Arthur Bernard Cook (1899). The Classical Review, 13, pp 220-220 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00078483

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

CORPUS TEXT OF OVID.

P. Ovidi Nasonis Opera ex corpore poetarum Latinorum a Iohanne Percival Postgate edito separatim typis impressa. Tomi i. ii. iii. Londini. G. Bell et Filii. MDCCCXCVIII.

MESSRS. Bell and Sons have issued in three pocketable volumes the text of Ovid contributed to Dr. Postgate's *Corpus* (i. 322–596) by Prof. A. Palmer, Mr. G. M. Edwards, Prof. G. A. Davies, Mr. S. G. Owen, Prof. A. E. Housman, and the general editor. The poems are well printed and a fairly wide margin is allowed. It is, however, a pity that an uneven number of lines has been allotted to a page: this does not matter in the case of hexameter pieces, but gives elegiacs an awkward appearance, since it frequently happens that an inset

pentameter commences a fresh page. A more serious defect is that room has not been found for the prolegomena and brief critical notes that add much to the value of the *Corpus*: no 'editio minor' should ever appear without an abridged 'apparatus.' Also the publishers have omitted the qualification by which the non-Ovidian *Heroides* were distinguished in the larger work—'P. Ovidi Nasonis quae feruntur Heroides xv.–xxi.' Dr. Postgate prefixes a note from Ovid to his public, which is worth quoting: 'P. Naso, a suorum corpore et societate diuulsus et tres quidem ille in Tomos discessurus, a uobis, Lectores Beneuoli, petit ut eam ueniam, quam cum inter ciues suos esset dederitis, nunc soli ac paene exuli nolitis auferre.'

ARTHUR BERNARD COOK.

SANDERS ON THE SOURCES OF LIVY.

Die Quellencontamination im 21 und 22 Buche des Livius, von HENRY A. SANDERS. Berlin: Mayer and Müller, 1898. 8vo. pp. xii, 149. Mk. 3.60.

IN the *Classical Review* for July, 1898, I gave a brief review of Dr. Sanders' inaugural dissertation of the same title, which formed the preliminary chapters of the completed work. He is to be congratulated on having so promptly fulfilled his promise, and so speedily removed his dissertation from the large class of unfinished works of the kind.

The book opens with a preface, in which the criticisms of Soltau on the preliminary chapters (*Woch. für klass. Phil.*, 1898, p. 491) are answered in detail.

The first two chapters of Dr. Sanders' work (pp. 1–50) have already been examined. The third takes up 'Die übrigen Quellen.' As regards Cassius Dio there is but little definite evidence. The use of a number of sources is assumed from his own words (72. 23), and the inference is confirmed by the results of investigation. It seems certain that he used Polybius, Livy, Coelius, and the early annalists. Plutarch in his biography of Fabius seems to have drawn especially upon Nepos, but he also made use of Livy, whom he not infrequently misunder-

stood, as well as Coelius. Dr. Sanders believes that he used the last-named authority directly, and not through the medium of Fenestella, as Soltau has assumed. Nepos himself, in his life of Hannibal, mentions as his sources Silenus, Sosilus, Sulpicius Blitho, Polybius, and Atticus. The last two appear to have been but little used, and to judge from his frequent errors, the writer's method of work would seem to have been, to read his sources, and then to write from memory, with little or no use of excerpts.

Very different was the method of the great historian Polybius, who used a great number of sources, but worked them over so carefully and combined them with such skill, that it is difficult, if not impossible, clearly to distinguish them. Dr. Sanders finds two 'scipionische Quellen,' one written and one oral (Laelius). Besides these Polybius used Silenus, Charaeus, and Sosilius, the last two being directly cited. Contrary to the current view Dr. Sanders, here agreeing with Soltau, decides that Cato was also used. To these sources the historian added oral information and the results of personal investigation of public records and documents. A common source for Livy and Polybius cannot be assumed,